

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 are pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen (US Patent 6,493,755).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hansen is cited for teaching a network administration system for automatically activating and deactivating dynamic rule sets in response to receipt of error logs from network devices and applications. The Examiner has equated applicant's recited "activating and deactivating" with performing a "notification action" as set forth in Hansen, column 5, line 27 to column 6, line 23. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation.

According to Hansen, management software 14 monitors network devices 18 and issues a "notification action" to the administrator when certain criteria set forth in the "notification rule" are met. This is clearly contemplated by the applicant as being prior art, and is discussed on the first page of applicant's specification under the heading "Background of the Invention," where reference is made to the use of "rule sets" to determine if a combination of logs satisfies a given criteria. Thus, the "notification rules" of Hansen are precisely equivalent to the "rule sets" discussed in applicant's specification. These notification rules or rule sets may be used to effectively *filter* the generation of excessive error logs (notification actions) to simplify troubleshooting for the administrator.

Hansen discloses the use of previous events or device conditions from the event log to pre-populate fields of a new notification rule (column 4, line 60 to column 5, line 13), thereby alleviating the administrator from the tedious task of transferring information from the network software into the new notification rule. While this may be an interesting and useful innovation, it has absolutely nothing to do with applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant's invention addresses the situation where multiple rule sets (notification rules) already exist within the system, and not with the problem of generating new notification rules based upon existing device conditions or previous event log data, as in Hansen. Upon receipt of error logs from network devices and applications, the system recited in applicant's claim 1 reads various "activation keys" that have been set by the user (administrator) through a user interface, and in response automatically activates or deactivates the indicated dynamic rule sets in accordance with the status change indicated by the activation key so as to cause the status of other rule sets also to change.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Hansen does not teach or suggest "automatically activating and deactivating dynamic rule sets" as recited in claims 1, 3 and 4. As discussed above, the activation or deactivation of a rule set is in no way equivalent to performing a "notification action" as suggested by the Examiner.

Hansen also fails to teach or suggest any user interface "for associating rule set activation keys with said rule sets". The Examiner has referenced column 6, lines 5 to 10 of Hansen to show that applicant's associating rule set

activation keys with said rule sets reads on “triggering of the notification rule”. The use of activation keys in applicant’s invention has absolutely nothing to do with triggering notification rules. As discussed above, the use of “rule sets” to determine if a combination of logs satisfies a given criteria is well known in the art. However, activation and deactivation or rule sets is not taught or suggested in Hansen or any of their prior art known to the applicant. Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that Hansen does not teach or suggest any program means for “reading said activation keys and one of either automatically activating or automatically deactivating said dynamic rule sets”. Hansen simply does not contemplate the use of activation keys or the automatic activation and deactivation of rule sets. Hansen speaks only to the automatic creation of new rule sets (notification rules) by pre-populating certain fields based on existing event log data and/or device conditions.

Finally, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hansen of activating or deactivating dynamic rule sets “so as to cause the status of other rule sets to change”, as claimed in claims 1, 3 and 4 of the present application. Each rule set is provided with an activation key which can be manually set or reset by the administrator. However, linking the activation of a particular rule set with other rule sets via the activation keys alleviates the time-consuming manual application rule sets by the administrator.

Claims 2 and 5 are rejected for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Hopper et al. (US Patent 5,367,609).

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and claim 4, respectfully. Hopper et al. fails to provide the necessary teaching discussed above that is absent from Hansen. Accordingly, Hopper does not cure the deficiencies of Hansen.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application including claims 1 to 5 is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Frank Chau  
Registration No. 34,136  
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889